

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Bernard Scott,	)	Civil Action No.: 4:17-cv-03100-RBH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Patricia Ray, Allison Days,	)	
Angela Sumpter, and Cpl. Shannon,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, who recommends granting Defendants’ motion for summary judgment and dismissing this action.<sup>1</sup> *See* ECF No. 67.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

No parties have filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.<sup>2</sup> In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Magistrate Judge issued the R & R in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (D.S.C.).

<sup>2</sup> Defendants’ objections were due by February 7, 2019, and Plaintiff’s objections were due by February 11, 2019, as he was served with the objections by mail. *See* ECF Nos. 67 & 68. As the R & R explains, Plaintiff is no longer incarcerated, so the prison mailbox rule does not apply. *See generally Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266, 271 (1988).

Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error and therefore adopts the Magistrate Judge's R & R [ECF No. 67]. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Defendants' motion for summary judgment [ECF No. 34] and **DISMISSES** this action *with prejudice*.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Florence, South Carolina  
February 12, 2019

s/ R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge